

## REMARKS

In the Office Action dated April 5, 2006 claims 1, 3, 4, 7 to 9, 11, 12, 15 to 19 and 22 are pending of which claims 1, 3, 4, 7 to 9, 11, 12, 15 to 19 and 22 are rejected.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7 to 9, 11, 12, 15 to 19 and 22 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,873,906 (Lau et al) in view of US Patent 5,562,726 (Chuter).

No amendments to the specification and claims are presented in this response.

Lau et al shows a method of reduction of the diameter of a stent graft by providing loops or stitches in a tether wire 320, 322 (Figure 21) which extends between circumferentially spaced loops 324 and 326 along the length of the body of the stent graft. Lau does not show, as is alleged by the Examiner, that the proximal end of the stent graft is held in place onto a deployment device at a plurality of points at the proximal end of the stent graft. Lau et al teaches diameter reduction along the length of a graft but does not teach or suggest retention at the proximal end. There are in fact no retention points on the stent graft at the proximal end and no teaching of retention to a delivery device at all. Circumferentially spaced apart points along the length of the stent graft are connected to each other and not to the delivery device.

The independent claims of the present application, claim 1, claim 9 and claim 22 each have the specific restriction of "retention of the stent graft prosthesis to the guide wire catheter at a plurality of retention points of the circumference of the proximal end of the stent graft prosthesis".

It is not reasonable, therefore, for the examiner to state that the reference Lau et al teaches that lobes of different size are formed at the proximal end of

the stent graft prosthesis in the sense that they are claimed in the present application. Longitudinal folds are formed to reduce the diameter of the stent graft for deployment but there are no lobes formed by retention points at the proximal end.

Chuter teaches that mooring loops can extend between a delivery system and graft but there is no teaching of lobes of different size at the proximal end of the stent graft.

We submit that the combination of Lau et al and Chuter does not teach or even suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention and we submit that the claimed invention is novel and inventive over these references taken singly or in combination. There is no teaching in the combination of the documents of retention to a delivery device at the proximal end of the stent graft to produce lobes of different sizes.

We submit that all claims of this application are novel and inventive.

The examination and reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested and it is further requested that this application be passed to issue.

Although the foregoing discussion is believed to be dispositive of the issues in this case, applicants' attorney requests a telephone interview with the Examiner to further discuss any unresolved issues remaining after the Examiner's consideration of this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

David Ernest Hartley

Date:

July 13, 2006

By



Richard J. Godlewski

Reg. No. 30,056

(812) 330-1824